
CITY OF COLUMBIA
DESIGN / DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 13, 2012- 4:00 PM
Internal Training, 3:00 pm; Regular Session – 4:00 PM

Minutes
Eau Claire Print Building
3907 Ensor Avenue • N. Main Street and Monticello Road • Columbia, SC

Members Present: Bruce Harper, Doris Hildebrand, Betsy Kaemmerlen, Dale Marshall, Lesesne Monteith, Dr. Leslie Skinner, Beronica Whisnant

Member Absent: Catherine Horne, David Ross

Staff Present: John Fellows, Jeff Crick, Lindsay Crick, Staci Richey, Jerre Threatt

Staff Absent: Amy Moore

The meeting was called to order by Vice-chairperson Dr. Skinner at 4:00 PM, Roll Call – Quorum established, swearing in of applicants and public speakers.

John Fellows, Planning Administrator, noted changes to the Agenda since publication. On the Regular Agenda, Urban, Items 1 and 2, **Huger Street and S/S Blossom Street**, have been deferred. Item 7, **1227 Princeton Street**, on the Historic Agenda, has been moved to the end of the agenda. He proceeded with review of the Consent Agenda.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. CONSENT AGENDA
URBAN

HISTORIC

- 1. 1328 Gadsden Street** (TMS# 09013-13-01) Certificate of Design Approval for exterior changes and site improvements. *Individual Landmark*
- 2. 1623 Richland Street** (TMS# R11404-02-19) Request for a Certificate of Design Approval for demolition of non-original rear addition. *Landmark District*
- 3. 1730 College Street** (TMS#11308-02-08) Request for a Certificate of Design Approval for exterior changes. *University Hill Architectural Conservation District*

Motion by Ms. Kaemmerlen to approve Consent Agenda items 1 – 3; seconded by Mr. Harper. Approval granted 7-0.

III. REGULAR AGENDA

URBAN

- 1. 500 Huger Street & S/S Blossom Street** (TMS#08914-16-02 and 08914-16-01) Request for Certificate of Site Plan Approval for student housing. *Innovista Design District*
- 2. 500 Huger Street & S/S Blossom Street** (TMS# 08914-16-02 and 08914-16-01) Request for Certificate of Design Approval for student housing. *Innovista Design District*

HISTORIC

1. 1210-14 Main Street (TMS# R09013-07-12) Request for a Certificate of Design Approval for the improvements and signage for the historic landmark
2. 612 Devine Street (TMS# R08914-03-01) Request for a recommendation for City Landmark status Group II, Pending Individual Review

DEFERRED

WITHDRAWN

3. **1311 Summerville Ave.** (TMS#R09113-02-04) Request for a Certificate of Design Approval for exterior changes. *Cottontown/Bellevue Architectural Conservation District*

Mr. Fellows recused himself from this case due to personal affiliation.

Staff Recommendation: Staff finds that the proposal for the porch balustrade and columns at 1311 Summerville Avenue complies with the pertinent sections for porches and materials, textures, and details as outlined in Sections VII and V of the Cottontown/Bellevue Architectural Conservation District guidelines due to there being no existing balustrade and the existing porch columns do not provide adequate support to the porch roof. Staff recommends granting a Certificate of Design Approval for these two proposals with details deferred to staff.

Section VII of the Guidelines, "Maintenance & Rehabilitation", does not support the replacement of existing wood siding with cement fiberboard and requires replacement in kind for wood siding which is no longer viable. Staff seeks input from the D/DRC as to whether an exception to the guidelines in this instance would be appropriate.

Joannie and Michael Nickel, homeowners, presented on their request. Norman and Kathleen Nickel owned the home in 2007, and Michael Nickels (their son) obtained permits in June 2007 to replace exterior siding with hardiplank. At that time, only the siding at the rear of the home was replaced along with a small section along the right side. At that time, the Cottontown Neighborhood was not a locally designated historic district, nor was the ordinance in place when the permits expired in December 2007 and March 2009. It became a district in June 2009. On July 25, 2012, Ms. Nickel came to obtain a permit to complete the siding replacement; however, since Cottontown is now a designated Architectural Conservation District, and the proposed work affects three visible sides of the house, review by the D/DRC is required.

Mr. Marshall stated that the guidelines do not allow for the use of hardiplank for replacement of wood. To possibly allow this would require a special exception perhaps that the applicants 1) started with hardiplank on one side of the house and continuing use of hardiplank on the other sides will match; 2) did invest in materials, something happened and the permits expired; the project may have been completed, and it would have been allowed if it continued timely. He again reminded if an exception is granted, it is important that this not set a precedent for future cases of someone "starting from scratch."

Ms. Kaemmerlen added another exception would be that the aluminum siding has deteriorated the wood siding to such a state that it is not feasible to repair or replace portions of the wood siding. Dr. Skinner added that in the time this lapsed, the neighborhood received designation and this would be another exception. Mr. Harper and Mr. Marshall agreed this would be considered a situation for special exception.

Motion by Mr. Marshall to grant a Certificate of Design Approval for **1311 Summerville Ave.** for renovation work deferring details for all things, excluding the siding, for staff review to coordinate further with the guidelines; to grant an exception to the guidelines to allow the replacement of wood siding with cement fiberboard because 1) the applicant initially obtained a valid permit prior to the implementation of the guidelines, 2) the work was on-going even though the permit was allowed to lapse for a period of time, and part of the siding of the house was already installed as hardiplank, and this will allow completion of the house in a single uniform material, and, 3) there were economic interests as the applicant had purchased

materials for the entire job at the initial stage of the job and by continuing the work will allow him to use the materials already purchased; *seconded by Mr. Monteith. Request granted 7-0.*

4. **1909 Henderson Street** (TMS# R11404-02-15) Request for Certificate of Design Approval as well as required DDRC review upon usage. *Landmark District*

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the D/DRC make a motion recommending a special exception for a food store (bakery) to the Board of Zoning Appeals for 1909 Henderson Street. Any details or further review on this property deferred to staff.

This is a 1930s building that is a non-contributing building in the Landmark District. The current owner wishes to establish a small bakery/food store within the structure. Other structures along this street are used for businesses; however a food store proposal requires D/DRC review and recommendation to the Board of Zoning Appeals based on the Zoning Ordinance. A special exception from the Board of Zoning Appeals is required to conduct the business. Signage will also be required. Given its non-contributing status, Staff is permitted to review and approve exterior changes to this structure.

Reggie and Darlene Bell, property owners, presented and stated that they want a bakery/food store and that this will not be a restaurant. .

Motion by Ms. Kaemmerlen to recommend a special exception for a food store/bakery to the Board of Zoning Appeals with all other details deferred to staff; *seconded by Ms. Whisnant. Request granted 7-0.*

5. **1614 Main Street** (TMS# 090-15-01) Request for Certificate of Design Approval for amendment to previously approved Bailey Bill application, *Individual Landmark* **DEFERRED**

6. **1225 Woodrow Street** (TMS# 11414-15-05) Request for Certificate of Design Approval for site improvements. *Melrose Heights/Oak Lawn Architectural Conservation District*

Staff Recommendation: Staff finds that the vinyl fence does not meet Section 8 of the guidelines, however, the proposed fast-growing, evergreen elaeagnus shrub or Confederate Jasmine vine on a 6' tall framework may prove sufficient to disguise the fence. Staff recommends approval on the condition that the shrubs or vine are able to disguise most of the fence within a year from today's date and that they be maintained for the life of the vinyl fence. If the plants have proved insufficient or have been installed in a way that does not hide most of the fence by that time, then the owners must remove the vinyl fence. Details are deferred to Staff.

Staci Richey, preservation planner, stated the former owners installed a white vinyl fence on this 1910s Craftsman home in 2009. A permit was not pulled by the contractors, and staff could not approve a vinyl fence. The owners came to D/DRC in October 2009 requesting permission to keep the fence and cover with landscaping to hide part of it. D/DRC denied the request, but added in their motion that the owners may present a new option for a fence at the site. The former owners sold the house to the current owners in April 2011 and sent staff a copy of a signed agreement between seller and buyer that a \$2,000 fence allowance would be given in the sale. The new owners finally agreed to allow mature landscaping on the left portion of the fence to grow and mask that area from view. The proposal is to use evergreen plants that will grow to the full height of the 6' vinyl fence and shield all of it from view from the public right of way.

Ms. Kaemmerlen stated that the plants decided on were not the best choice to use, and suggested that other species be considered and used. Mr. Marshall stated the guidelines require that a vinyl fence not be visible; and felt it would be a good suggestion to have the use of other plant types included in the motion. Ms. Richey said she will be glad to discuss other types of plants that can be used if the D/DRC desires; and

reminded the D/DRC that they are charged with determining whether or not concept of using plants to screen the fence will meet the guidelines or effectively screen them from the public right of way.

Motion by Mr. Marshall to grant a Certificate of Design Approval for **1225 Woodrow Street** to retain the existing vinyl fence provided the fence along the rear property line is relocated inward and a sufficient evergreen shrub is planted to substantially hide the fence by the end of 2012, and a landscape plan for the street front be developed to hide the fence by that same timeframe, or that the applicant be required to remove the fence and replace it with materials that comply with the neighborhood guidelines.

Motion modified by Mr. Marshall to require the applicant to remove or replace the fence materials to comply with the guidelines; *seconded by Mr. Harper. Request granted 7-0.*

7. 1227 Princeton Street (TMS# R13901-04-05) Request for a Certificate of Design Approval for exterior changes. *Melrose Heights Architectural Conservation District*

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends a Certificate of Design Approval for the railing, with details deferred to Staff. Staff requests a determination on the chimneys.

Staci Richey, City Planner, presented on this brick veneer home where the applicant is requesting a 2" picket railing across the front porch as required by code. The home already has a non-original porch across the side and rear that has a 2" vertical picket balustrade. Ms. Richey asked the D/DRC to make a determination about the chimneys that were rebuilt.

The applicant was not in attendance.

Mr. Monteith questioned the issue of the chimneys, and Mr. Marshall provided a background of the case that presented several months prior where the applicant tore down and rebuilt the chimneys without permission. The D/DRC directed the chimneys be rebuilt to match. Ms. Richey clarified that certain rebuild specifications were given by the D/DRC for the chimneys to correct a few issues; the applicant attempted to do so, however the specifications were not done properly. The property has already been sold, and though Staff took the applicant to court, because of an error by a court clerk the case was not heard.

Mr. Monteith felt the chimneys were fine. Mr. Marshall said, at this point, they are not exact, but an attempt of what was there. They are non-functional chimneys at this time. Review of the guidelines and overall character of the house, it appears the two chimneys as reconstructed are close enough approximations of what was there.

Motion by Mr. Monteith to grant a Certificate of Design Approval for **227 Princeton Street** for exterior changes as per staff recommendation for approval of the railing with details deferred to staff, and that the chimneys as restored are acceptable; *seconded by Mr. Harper. Request granted 7-0.*

8. 2714 Columbia Avenue (TMS# 09110-16-01) Request for a Certificate of Design Approval for new construction. *Earlewood Protection Area A*

Staff Recommendation: *Staff finds that the proposed single-family house proposed for 2714 (may be addressed at 2712) Columbia Avenue, TMS#09110-16-01 substantially complies with the pertinent guidelines for Site & Setting and New Construction as outlined in Sections VI and VII of the Earlewood Protection Area Design Guidelines.*

Staff recommends granting a Certificate of Design Approval for the new construction with the following conditions:

- a. The driveway be relocated to the right side of the house and poured to be perpendicular to the street as indicated in red on the site plan; and the house have a setback no more than 30' from the right-of-way.
- b. Cement fiberboard siding shall be smooth, and all trim and detailing match traditional dimensions found within the district.
- c. All details deferred to staff.

Lindsay Crick, preservation planner, stated all materials are compliant with the Earlewood Protection Area Design Guidelines; staff's concern was with the driveway which should align with the house. The applicant stated he does not object to moving the driveway to the right side.

Chris Hinrichs, applicant, presented on the 1,500 sq. ft. house that will have a crawlspace and hardiplank siding and trim, architectural shingle roof, door with transom, and columns to match other houses in the neighborhood. A chimney was considered, but will not be done to keep the cost of the home down. The soffit detail will be metal fascia and metal soffits. Pervious pavement materials have been considered, and recycled materials will possibly be used.

Motion by Ms. Whisnant to grant a Certificate of Design Approval for 2714 (which may addressed as 2712) Columbia Avenue for new construction subject to the following conditions noted by staff: the driveway to be relocated to the right side of the house and paved perpendicular to the street as indicated in red on the site plan, the house will have a setback of not more than 30' from the right of way, the cement fiberboard siding shall be smooth, and all trim and detailing match traditional dimensions found within the district, and all details deferred to staff; *seconded by Ms. Kaemmerlen. Request approved 7-0.*

9. 1108 Lancaster Street (TMS# 09107-11-03) Request for Certificate of Design Approval for new construction. *Earlewood Protection Area A* **DEFERRED**
10. 2150 Harden Street (TMS# 041501-11-01) Request for a Certificate of Design Approval for repairs. *Individual Landmark* **DEFERRED**

11. **910 King Street (TMS#11413-13-07)** Review of unapproved exterior changes. *Old Shandon/Lower Waverly Protection Area A*

Staff Recommendation: Staff finds that the replacement of the historic wood door does not comply with the pertinent sections of the guidelines in Section IV – C: Exterior Changes, and recommends that a Certificate of Design Approval be denied.

- Staff would be happy to work with the applicant in selecting an appropriate door

Jerre Threatt, preservation planner, stated this case was for unapproved replacement of a historic wood front door on a ca 1930 house where work had already begun. Staff was not aware of this project as the property owner did not seek design approval or obtain applicable permits. Staff allowed the door to remain in place for safety reasons until review by the D/DRC. The new door that was installed is a fanlight door, which is not similar to the original and does not fit the architectural style of the house. Although the historic wood door that was removed had a space for a solid glass upper insert, the door originally featured four vertical glass panes that matched the configuration of the windows. The property owner seemed amenable to installing a door with a more compatible design. Staff recommends removing the fanlight door and replacing it with a more visually compatible design, such as one with four vertical exterior muntins like the original or one with a solid clear glass upper insert that was recently approved for one of the houses within the same

block. Security concerns can easily be addressed by installing optically clear shatterproof window protection film or an internal security grate.

The applicant was not in attendance.

Motion by Mr. Marshall to recommend denial of a Certificate of Design Approval for 910 King Street of unapproved exterior changes as currently applied; **approval to grant** a Certificate of Design Approval, with details deferred to staff, for a new door to match the original door configuration of the house, particular encouragement given to the applicant to match the same mutton configuration in the door as in the upper sash of the windows; *seconded by Ms. Kaemmerlen. Request granted 7-0.*

12. 2323 Santee Avenue (TMS#11409-07-37) Review of unapproved exterior changes.
Old Shandon/Lower Waverly Protection Area A

Staff Recommendation: Staff finds that the proposal complies with the pertinent sections of the guidelines in Section IV – B: Additions/Enclosures to Existing Buildings and C: Exterior Changes. Staff recommends granting a Certificate of Design Approval for replacing the historic wood windows, front entry door, and constructing an addition on the rear of the house with all details deferred to staff.

Jerre Threatt, preservation planner, stated the historic wood windows on this ca. 1940 house were replaced with vinyl grilles between glass (GBG) units which do not match the original wood windows as required in the design guidelines. A permit was obtained for a new roof and interior repairs, but the permit did not include any exterior changes. A stop work order issued, and the applicant removed the vinyl GBG windows. The applicant was amendable to match the window configurations as set forth in the design guidelines. The applicant also replaced the front entry door, and was in the process of building an addition on the rear of the house. An existing addition was removed prior to construction of the new addition, which stretches all the way across the rear of the house and is visible from the public right-of-way on both sides.

The applicant is proposing to use wood or vinyl windows with exterior muntins that match the original 8/1 windows. The proposed front door is a wood door with one large light. The siding for the addition will be wood to match the existing siding. These proposed exterior changes can be worked out at staff level if the D/DRC is comfortable with deferring all details to staff.

Aaron Addison, applicant, found vinyl windows with the muttons on the outside that will give the same configuration as 8/1 windows. The homeowner prefers to use vinyl as wood costs more. Mr. Addison found a wood door with half pane glass to match the windows. He will be glad to work with staff and abide to the D/DRC decision.

Mr. Threatt stated this is a protection area and the specific guidelines state when replacing windows, the pane configuration should match the existing; however the homeowner can replace the windows with vinyl if desired.

Motion by Mr. Monteith to grant a Certificate of Design Approval for **2323 Santee Avenue** of unapproved exterior changes to replace the historic wood windows, front entry door, and construction of the rear addition with all details deferred to staff.

Mr. Addison said there is not a rear door, and he was considering a metal door for replacement, asking if there would be issues with that. Mr. Threatt stated as it is not visible from the right-of-way. any material can be used. Dr. Skinner thanked him for asking before replacing the door.

Motion seconded by Ms. Hildebrand. Request granted 7-0.

13. 1332 Main Street (TMS# R09013-06-03) Request for a Certificate of Design Approval for exterior changes. *Individual Landmark*

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff finds that the proposal does not adequately meet items 5 and 6 of the City of Columbia Zoning Ordinance, Section 17-674(d), and so does not recommend approval for the proposal.

John Fellows, planning Administrator, presented on this request for new doors for a new business venture, Circa 1332, which is housed in the front left side of the historic Arcade Building on Main Street. Since the location of the doors was not part of the street storefront and because the original doors were no longer present, staff was working with the applicants at staff level on the replacement. The owners purchased historical wood doors prior to remodeling which staff found acceptable. The issue is the doors are a natural door, and the remainder of the building is dark black paint application to the windows. The other doors in the vestibule area are a metal storefront system type.

Amy Moore, preservation planner, listed Section 17-674(d) of the Ordinance that deals with individual landmarks and material replacement, and additions to landmarks in terms of materials. Staff was unable to grant a Certificate of Design Approval based on items 5 and 6 of the Ordinance; essentially it is the finish that staff found problematic for approval at staff level. Staff felt a black wash on the doors would be more appropriate.

The owner was not available at this time. Staff report indicates the doors had not been installed, however the doors were installed and operating, and the store is open for business. The business owners prefer to keep the doors with the natural finish.

Mr. Monteith said so many changes made to this building over the years, there are no original doors or materials on the building, but felt the doors are very visible. Mr. Marshall felt, in looking at the doors from a guideline perspective, it was hard to see anything original. He does not feel the doors are acceptable no matter what color they are painted, and are not in keeping with the historic store front.

Ms. Kaemmerlen referred to item 6, “....the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials.” The intent is to match the surrounding context, and she feels Ms. Moore is correct in saying the ‘warm, honey tone of that feature is found in that façade’ is inappropriate and should be a color that matches its context.

Discussion among the D/DRC ensued regarding the replacement of the doors and the interpretation of the Ordinance, as well as allowing the doors if they are painted. Mr. Monteith felt because the doors are already in place and there is such a mixture of doors and finishes in the building, they can remain as they are.

Motion by Mr. Marshall to grant a Certificate of Design Approval for 1332 Main Street for exterior changes to allow the doors to remain as installed, based on the fact that the doors are in a non-historic aluminum anodized system and the doors themselves are not an integral part of the original fabric of the building, and that there are only one existing remaining apparent original door unit. So they are not inconsistent with the other door replacement units in the building; *seconded by Mr. Monteith.*

Ms. Kaemmerlen said she “does not understand how this context doesn’t set a precedent that anybody with a landmark building that has a diversity of elements can use that as an argument to put in more diverse elements”.

Mr. Marshall stated that is not the intent of what he put into the motion, because there is no original existing storefront on the exterior of this building,, he does not feel a precedent is being set on this building. If the applicant were proposing a major renovation to the exterior of the storefront, the D/DRC would go back to the precedent of trying to find what the original storefront of the building was, and consistently match that throughout.

Dr. Grainger, the applicant, arrived at this time.

Dr. Skinner stated there was a motion on the floor and a vote needed to be taken. **Request granted 5-2, with Ms. Kaemmerlen and Ms. Whisnant opposed.**

14. 929-31 Gervais Street (TMS# 00000000000000000000) Review for a Certificate of Design Approval for awnings and signage. W. Gervais Street Historic Commercial District

WITHDRAW

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

July and August

Motion by Ms. Kaemmerlen to approve the July minutes with changes submitted to Ms. Moore and approval of the August minutes as well; seconded by Mr. Harper.

VI. ADJOURN

There being no further business, there was a motion to adjourn by Ms. Kaemmerlen; seconded by Mr. Monteith. Meeting adjourned at 5:27 PM



Chairperson



Date

Respectfully submitted by Andrea Wolfe
Sr. Admin. Secretary
Planning and Development Services Department